APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,610	05/17/2006	Haraldur Thorkelsson	5700-032 / OZ-0003	3542

66881   7590   03/03/2009
COATS & BENNETT/OZ
1400 CRESCENT GREEN
SUITE 300
CARY, NC 27518

EXAMINER
BHATIA, AJAY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2445	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/03/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/579,610	THORKELSSON ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		AJAY BHATIA	2445

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 May 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-37* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-37* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date *8/7/2007; 8/11/2006*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Claim(s) 10-14 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. While the claims recite a series of steps or acts to be performed, a statutory "process" under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to particular machine, or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or thing. See page 10 of In Re Bilski 88 USPQ2d 1385. The instant claims are neither positively tied to a particular machine that accomplishes the claimed method steps nor transform underlying subject matter, and therefore do not qualify as a statutory process. The method including steps of … is broad enough that the claim could be completely performed mentally, verbally or without a machine nor is any transformation apparent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 18, 19 and 28 and 29 recites the limitation "said periodic determining" in second line. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The claims do no mention previously "a periodic determining step."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-17, 20-27 and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Munarriz et al. (United States Patent Application Publication

2002015687) in view of Kadyk et al. (United States Patent 6895425).

For claim 1, Munarriz teaches, a wireless e-mail system comprising:

a wireless mobile device comprising an e-mail client; (Munarriz,)

   an e-mail server; (Munarriz, paragraph 52, email server)

   a gateway; (Munarriz, paragraph 62, gateway)

   a wireless network interconnecting said wireless mobile device and said

gateway; (Munarriz, paragraph 62, gateway, figure 8)

   and a broadband network interconnecting said gateway and said e-mail server;

(Munarriz, paragraph 62, figure 8)

   wherein when said client transmits a single self-contained request to said

gateway via said wireless network to retrieve a set of e-mail related information from

said e-mail server, said gateway retrieves at least said e-mail related information from,

(Munarriz, paragraph 54, paragraph 54, HTTP POST.request, email headers list),

compiles said retrieved information into a single self contained response and transmits

said single response via said wireless network to said e-mail client. (Munarriz,

paragraph 54, email headers, complied into XML file)

Munarriz fails to explicitly disclose, said e-mail server via said broadband network using

a plurality of transactions

Kadyk teaches, said e-mail server via said broadband network using a plurality of

transactions, (Kadyk, Col. 3 line 60 to Col. 4 line 5, sequence)

Munarriz and Kadyk are both in the field of wireless devices

Munarriz and Kadyk are compatible since Munarriz is designed to operate with multiple

types of applications, Kadyk, Col. 2 line 60 to Col. 3 line 3)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having

ordinary skill in the art to combine Munarriz and Kadyk because by combining it allows

for simplified and smaller devices. (Kadyk, Col. 2 lines 19-23)

For claim 2, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the wireless e-mail system as in claim 1, wherein

said self-contained request and said single response form a stateless request-response

pair. (Kadyk, Col. 3 line 60 to Col. 4 line 5, routine) and (Munarriz, paragraph 54, email

headers, complied into XML file) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection

of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 2.

For claim 3, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the wireless e-mail system as in claim 1, wherein said e-mail server is an IMAP server and said gateway further comprises an IMAP client application for communicating with said IMAP server. (Munarriz, paragraph 56, IMAP)

For claim 4, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the wireless e-mail system as in claim 1, wherein said e-mail server is a POP3 server and said gateway further comprises an POP3 client application for communicating with said POP3 server. (Munarriz, paragraph 56, POP3)

For claim 5, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the wireless e-mail system as in claim 1, wherein said e-mail server is an SMTP compatible server and said gateway further comprises an SMTP client application for communicating with said SMTP compatible server. (Munarriz, paragraph 44, smtp)

For claim 6, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the wireless e-mail system as in claim 1, wherein said gateway further comprises an application for monitoring e-mail traffic. (Munarriz, paragraph 59, subscriber database)

For claim 7, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the wireless e-mail system as in claim 1, further comprising a mobile operator network, wherein said gateway is an extension of said mobile operator network. (Munarriz, paragraph 62, gateway)

For claim 8, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the wireless e-mail system as in claim 1, wherein

said single self-contained request and said single self contained response are

transmitted using HTTP. (Munarriz, paragraph 23, 25, HTTP)

For claim 9, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the wireless e-mail system as in claim 1, wherein

said single self-contained request and said single self contained response are

implemented using an XML structure. (Munarriz, paragraph 43, XML)

For claim 10, Munarriz teaches, a gateway interconnecting a wireless mobile device and

an e-mail server, the wireless mobile device comprising an e-mail client and adapted for

data communication with a wireless network, the e-mail server adapted for data

communication with a broadband network, the gateway comprising:

a first stateless interface interconnected with the wireless network; (Munarriz,

paragraph 54, email headers, complied into XML file)

a second interface interconnected with the broadband network; (Munarriz,

paragraph 62, gateway, figure 8)

and a channel management function; (Munarriz, paragraph 62, gateway, figure 8)

wherein when the e-mail client transmits a single self-contained request to said

first interface via said wireless network to retrieve a set of e-mail related information

from the e-mail server, said channel management function retrieves at least said e-mail

related information from the e-mail server, (Munarriz, paragraph 54, paragraph 54,

HTTP POST.request, email headers) compiles said retrieved information into a single

self contained response and transmits said single response via said first interface and the mobile network to the e-mail client. (Munarriz, paragraph 54, email headers, complied into XML file)

Munarriz fails to clearly disclose, said second interface and the broadband network using a plurality of transactions

Kadyk teaches, said second interface and the broadband network using a plurality of transactions (Kadyk, Col. 3 line 60 to Col. 4 line 5, sequence)

Munarriz and Kadyk are both in the field of wireless devices

Munarriz and Kadyk are compatible since Munarriz is designed to operate with multiple types of applications, Kadyk, Col. 2 line 60 to Col. 3 line 3)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Munarriz and Kadyk because by combining it allows for simplified and smaller devices. (Kadyk, Col. 2 lines 19-23)

For claim 11, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the gateway as in claim 10, wherein the e-mail server is an IMAP server, and said second interface is an IMAP interface. (Munarriz, paragraph 56, IMAP4)

For claim 12, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the gateway as in claim 10, wherein the e-mail

server is a POP3 server, and said second interface is a POP3 interface. (Munarriz,

paragraph 56 POP3)

For claim 13, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the gateway as in claim 10, further comprising

an e-mail traffic monitoring application. (Munarriz, paragraph 59, subscriber database)

For claim 14, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the gateway as in claim 10, wherein said single

self-contained request and response are transmitted using HTTP and said first interface

is an HTTP interface. (Munarriz, paragraph 23, 25, HTTP)

For claim 15, Munarriz teaches, a method for retrieving e-mail related information from

an e-mail server via a communications system comprising a wireless network and a

broad band network, the method comprising the steps of:

in a client e-mail application on a wireless mobile device, forming a single

request for the e-mail related information; (Munarriz, paragraph 54, HTTP

POST.request)

transmitting said single request to a gateway via the wireless network, said

gateway retrieving at least the e-mail related information from the server, wherein said

gateway compiles said retrieved information into a single response; (Munarriz,

paragraph 54, email headers, complied into XML file)

transmitting said single response to said client application via said wireless

network; (Munarriz, paragraph 54, email headers, complied into XML file, paragraph 62,

Wireless)

and in said client application, retrieving the e-mail related information from said

response. (Munarriz, paragraph 57, display)

Munarriz fails to clearly disclose, the broadband network using a plurality of transactions

Kadyk teaches, the broadband network using a plurality of transactions (Kadyk, Col. 3

line 60 to Col. 4 line 5, sequence)

Munarriz and Kadyk are both in the field of wireless devices

Munarriz and Kadyk are compatible since Munarriz is designed to operate with multiple

types of applications, Kadyk, Col. 2 line 60 to Col. 3 line 3)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having

ordinary skill in the art to combine Munarriz and Kadyk because by combining it allows

for simplified and smaller devices. (Kadyk, Col. 2 lines 19-23)

For claim 16, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 15, wherein the e-mail

related information is located in a mailbox on the server, wherein said request

comprises a mailbox ID and further wherein said retrieving step comprises logging onto the server using the mailbox ID and downloading the requested e-mail related information. (Munarriz, paragraph 47, logon)

For claim 17, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 15, wherein the e-mail related information is located in a mailbox on the server, wherein said gateway periodically determines if new e-mail is available in said mailbox and further wherein if at least one new e-mail message is available in said mailbox, said gateway transmits a new e-mail message notification to said client application via said wireless network. (Munarriz, paragraph 61, new mail notification)

For claim 20, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 17, wherein said new e-mail message notification transmitting step comprises appending said new e-mail message notification to a subsequent single response. (Munarriz, paragraph 61, new mail notification)

For claim 21, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 17, wherein said wireless mobile device is an SMS compatible device and said new e-mail message notification transmitting step comprises transmitting said new e-mail message notification to said client e-mail application using SMS. (Munarriz, paragraph 63, SMS)

For claim 22, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 17, wherein said wireless

mobile device is a WAP compatible device and said new e-mail message notification

transmitting step comprises transmitting said new e-mail message notification to said

client e-mail application using WAP. (Munarriz, paragraph 62, WAP)

For claim 23, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 17, wherein for each said

new e-mail message said gateway retrieves at least a message sender and a message

subject and appends said message sender and a message subject to a new e-mail list

and wherein said new e-mail message notification comprises said new e-mail list.

(Munarriz, paragraph 61, new mail notification, XML document)

For claim 24, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 17, wherein said gateway

determines a quantity of new e-mail messages available in said mailbox and said new

e-mail message notification comprises said quantity. (Munarriz, paragraph 61, new mail

notification), it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to

calculate the quantity of new messages.

For claim 25, Munarriz teaches, a method for retrieving e-mail related information from

an e-mail server via a communications system comprising a wireless' network and a

broad band network, the method comprising the steps of: providing an e-mail gateway

comprising a first stateless interface interconnected with the wireless network and a

second interface interconnected with the broadband network; (Munarriz, paragraph 52,

email server, paragraph 62, gateway, figure 8)

in a client e-mail application on a wireless mobile device, transferring a single

request for the e-mail related information to said first interface via the wireless network;

(Munarriz,) in said gateway:

receiving said request at said first interface; (Munarriz, paragraph 54, paragraph

54, HTTP POST.request, email headers list),

compiling said retrieved information into a single response; (Munarriz,

paragraph 54, email headers, complied into XML file)

and transmitting said single response to said client application via said first

interface and said wireless network; (Munarriz, paragraph 54, email headers, complied

into XML file, paragraph 62, Wireless)

and in said client application, retrieving the e-mail related information from said

response. (Munarriz, paragraph 57, display)

Munarriz fails to clearly disclose, retrieving at least the requested e-mail related

information from the server via the broadband network using a plurality of transactions;

retrieving at least the requested e-mail related information from the server via the

broadband network using a plurality of transactions; (Kadyk, Col. 3 line 60 to Col. 4 line

5, sequence)

Munarriz and Kadyk are both in the field of wireless devices

Munarriz and Kadyk are compatible since Munarriz is designed to operate with multiple types of applications, Kadyk, Col. 2 line 60 to Col. 3 line 3)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Munarriz and Kadyk because by combining it allows for simplified and smaller devices. (Kadyk, Col. 2 lines 19-23)

For claim 26, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 25, wherein the e-mail related information is located in a mailbox on the server, wherein said request comprises a mailbox ID and further wherein said retrieving step comprises logging onto the server using the mailbox ID and downloading the requested e-mail related information. (Munarriz, paragraph 47, logon)

For claim 27, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 25, wherein the e-mail related information is located in a mailbox on the server, wherein said gateway periodically determines if new e-mail is available in said mailbox and further wherein if at least one new e-mail message is available in said mailbox, said gateway transmits a new e-mail message notification to said client application via said wireless network. (Munarriz, paragraph 61, new mail notification)

For claim 30, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 27, wherein said new e-mail message notification transmitting step comprises appending said new e-mail message notification to a subsequent single response. (Munarriz, paragraph 61, new mail notification, XML document)

For claim 31, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 27, wherein said wireless mobile device is an SMS compatible device and said new e-mail message notification transmitting step comprises transmitting said new e-mail message notification to said client e-mail application via SMS. (Munarriz, paragraph 63, SMS)

For claim 32, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 27, wherein said wireless mobile device is a WAP compatible device and said new e-mail message notification transmitting step comprises transmitting said new e-mail message notification to said client e-mail application using WAP. (Munarriz, paragraph 62, WAP)

For claim 33, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 27, wherein for each said new e-mail message said gateway retrieves at least a message sender and a message subject and appends said message sender and a message subject to a new e-mail list and wherein said new e-mail message notification comprises said new e-mail list. (Munarriz, paragraph 61, new mail notification, XML document)

For claim 34, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 27, wherein said gateway determines a quantity of new e-mail messages available in said mailbox and said new e-mail message notification comprises said quantity. (Munarriz, paragraph 61, new mail notification), it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to calculate the quantity of new messages.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 18, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munarriz-Kadyk in view of Wener et al. (United States Patent Application Publication 20060085429)

For claim 18, Munarriz-Kadyk teach, the method of claim 15, wherein the e-mail server is an IMAP server, said mailbox has a mailbox name (Munarriz, paragraph 56, IMAP4, paragraph 47, logon)

Munarriz-Kadyk fail to clearly disclose, said periodic determining step comprises transmitting a SELECT command including said mailbox name to the server.

Munarriz-Kadyk and Wener are both in the field of communicating with a IMAP servers

Munarriz-Kadyk and Wener are compatible, because Wener is the procedure of accessing a folder on a IMAP server

Wener teaches, the method of claim 15, wherein the e-mail server is an IMAP server, said mailbox has a mailbox name and said periodic determining step comprises transmitting a SELECT command including said mailbox name to the server. (Wener, paragraphs 30, 34-46)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Munarriz-Kadyk with the method of using the SELECT command to retrieve the content of the mailbox on a periodic basis because it is something that is commonly done in the art. (Wener, paragraph 30, Today, most of the existing...)

For claim 28, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 25, wherein the e-mail server is an IMAP server, said mailbox has a mailbox name (Munarriz, paragraph 56, IMAP4, paragraph 47, logon)

Munarriz-Kadyk fails to clearly disclose, said periodically determining step comprises transmitting a SELECT command including said mailbox name to the server.

Munarriz-Kadyk and Wener are both in the field of communicating with a IMAP servers

Munarriz-Kadyk and Wener are compatible, because Wener is the procedure of accessing a folder on a IMAP server

Wener teaches, the method of claim 15, wherein the e-mail server is an IMAP server, said mailbox has a mailbox name and said periodic determining step comprises transmitting a SELECT command including said mailbox name to the server. (Wener, paragraphs 30, 34-46)

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Munarriz-Kadyk with the method of using the SELECT command to retrieve the content of the mailbox on a periodic basis because it is something that is commonly done in the art. (Wener, paragraph 30, Today, most of the existing...)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 19, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munarriz-Kadyk in view of Gorty et al. (United States Patent Application Publication 20050171996A1)

For claim 19, Munarriz-Kadyk the method of claim 15, wherein the e-mail server is a POP3 server, said mailbox has a mailbox name (Munarriz, paragraph 56 POP3, paragraph 47, logon)

Munarriz-Kadyk fails to clearly disclose, said periodic determining step comprises transmitting a UIDL command including said mailbox name to the server.

the method of claim 15, wherein the e-mail server is a POP3 server, said mailbox has a mailbox name and said periodic determining step comprises transmitting a UIDL command including said mailbox name to the server. (Munarriz, paragraph 23, periodic polling, uidl)

Munarriz-Kadyk and Wener are both in the field of communicating with a POP servers

Munarriz-Kadyk and Wener are compatible, because Wener is the procedure of accessing a email on a POP server

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Munarriz-Kadyk with Gorty because Gorty provides a more efficient means of accessing a POP email account. (Gorty, paragraph 9, 11)

For claim 29, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 25, wherein the e-mail server is a POP3 server, said mailbox has a mailbox name (Munarriz, paragraph 56 POP3, paragraph 47, logon)

Munarriz-Kadyk fails to clearly disclose, said periodically determining step comprises transmitting a UIDL command including said mailbox name to the server.

wherein the e-mail server is a POP3 server, said mailbox has a mailbox name and said periodically determining step comprises transmitting a UIDL command including said mailbox name to the server. (Gorty, paragraph 23, periodic polling, uidl)

Munarriz-Kadyk and Wener are both in the field of communicating with a POP servers

Munarriz-Kadyk and Wener are compatible, because Wener is the procedure of accessing a email on a POP server

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having

ordinary skill in the art to combine Munarriz-Kadyk with Gorty because Gorty provides a

more efficient means of accessing a POP email account. (Gorty, paragraph 9, 11)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Munarriz in view of Cocchi et al. "Pricing in computer networks: motivation, formulation,

and example".

For claim 35, Munarriz teaches, a method for logging e-mail data traffic between at least

one wireless mobile device comprising a client e-mail application and an e-mail server

interconnected by a wireless mobile operator network and a broadband network, the

mobile network comprised of a wireless network and a ground network, the wireless

network interconnecting the at least one wireless mobile device and the ground network

and wherein the e-mail data traffic comprises at least one request for e-mail related

information generated by the client e-mail application, the method comprising the steps

of:

provide an e-mail gateway between the ground network and the broadband

network; (Munarriz, paragraph 62, gateway, figure 8)

for each request generated by the client e-mail application, transferring the

request to said gateway via the wireless network; (Munarriz, paragraph 54, paragraph

54, HTTP POST.request, email headers list, paragraph 62, wireless),

and in said gateway: receiving each request; (Munarriz, paragraph 54, paragraph

54, HTTP POST.request, email headers list),

retrieving at least the requested e-mail related information from the e-mail server;

(Munarriz, paragraph 54, paragraph 54, HTTP POST.request, email headers list),

compiling said retrieved information into a single response; (Munarriz, paragraph

54, email headers, complied into XML file)

logging said single response; (Munarriz, paragraphs 59, 60, long term message

store)

and transmitting said single response to said client application via said wireless

network. (Munarriz, paragraph 54, email headers, complied into XML file)

Munarriz fail to disclose clearly, logging each received request;

Cocchi teaches, logging each received request; (Cocchi, page 615, per-byte price,

charging is inherently is logging)

Munarriz and Cocchi are both in the field of network communication

Munarriz and Cocchi are compatible

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Munarriz with Cocchi method of billing to make money. (Cocchi, page 614, abstract)

For claim 36, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 35, wherein said request logging step comprises storing the number of bytes of each request. (Cocchi, page 615, per-byte price, charging is inherently is logging) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 35, applies equally as well to claim 36.

For claim 37, Munarriz-Kadyk teaches, the method of claim 35, wherein said response logging step comprises storing the number of bytes of each response. (Cocchi, page 615, per-byte price, charging is inherently is logging) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 35, applies equally as well to claim 37.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached Notice of references cited (if appropriate).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AJAY BHATIA whose telephone number is (571)272-3906. The examiner can normally be reached on M, T, H, F 9:00-3:30, Also please fax interview requests to 571-273-3906.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571-272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ajay Bhatia/
Examiner, Art Unit 2445